



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A/D
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,641	10/12/2001	Daniel Xu	INTO-0004-US	2057

7590 07/16/2002
Timothy N. Trop
TROP, PRUNNER & HU, P.C.
STE 100
8554 KATY FWY
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

EXAMINER

BAUMEISTER, BRADLEY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2815

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/976,641

Applicant(s)
Xu et al.

Examiner
B. William Baumeister

Art Unit
2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (e). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 24, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 1-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2815

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 11, 12 and 16-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ovshinsky '205 in view of Chang '995.

a. Ovshinsky discloses a memory storage array employing phase-change memory material and includes the following structures (see e.g., FIG. 1 and cols. 15-16): a p-type semiconductor substrate 10 (unnumbered in FIG 1); a plurality of buried n⁺ channels (wordlines) 12 that couple various memory cells (see e.g., FIG 3); an n epitaxial layer 14; isolation trenches 16 on either side of each of the buried lines 12; p⁺ diffusion layer 24; SiO₂ insulation layer 20 having a plurality of apertures (or pores) 22; metal contact 32; memory material 36 having a lower portion which extends into the insulation pores 22; and upper contact 40. Restated, Ovshinsky discloses all of the limitations of the listed claims except for the presence of a lightly doped n-type region interposed between the n⁺ wordline 12 and the p-type substrate.

b. Chang is directed towards a ROM diode array having n⁺ conductive lines 32 diffused into a p-type substrate 20 with a p⁺ regions 40 diffused, in turn, into the n⁺ conductive

Art Unit: 2815

lines 32 to form the memory diode. Chang further teaches that additional, more lightly doped n-diffusion regions 38 are formed under the n+ conductive lines 32 for the purpose of preventing current leakage between the n+ conductive lines 32 and the p-substrate 20 (e.g., col. 4, lines 10-). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have further included additional, more lightly doped n-type regions between the n+ channel and p-substrate of the Ovshinsky memory device for the purpose of reducing current leakage as taught by Chang.

c. Claim 20 further recites that the pore is lined with a sidewall spacer. The Examiner notes that under the broadest reasonable interpretation, the term "sidewall spacer" relates to the method by which the insulation layer and aperture is formed, and nothing in the claim precludes the sidewall spacer from being formed of the same material as that of the insulating layer. As such, because SiO₂ is an amorphous material with no long-range grain boundaries, there is no structural distinction between calling the entire SiO₂ layer an insulation layer, or alternatively labeling a portion of the SiO₂ as an insulation layer and another portion as a sidewall spacer. Restated, as the portion of SiO₂ adjacent the pore forms a sidewall and spaces the pore and its contents from the rest of the insulation layer 20, this adjacent portion can be labeled a sidewall spacer, so the Ovshinsky reference also teaches the language of this claim.

d. Regarding claim 23, in that Ovshinsky is directed towards a digital memory array, and such arrays' primary (if not only) intended use is for storing electronic data in a machine that manipulates digital data (i.e., a computer), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2815

the art at the time of the invention that the Ovshinsky memory device may be used in a computer for the purpose of using it for its intended purpose, regardless of whether Ovshinsky expressly, implicitly or inherently teaches as much.

e. Regarding claim 24, Ovshinsky further discloses (see e.g., FIG 4 and col. 19) an addressing matrix (interface) 52 and integrated circuitry connections (bus) 53 coupled to the storage array 51. Further, regardless of whether Ovshinsky expressly discusses the presences of a processor, one would inherently be present in the computer and coupled to the storage so that the storage will work for its intended purpose of storing memory that is to be processed by a processor.

3. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ovshinsky/Chang as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Holmberg et al. '705. As explained above Ovshinsky/Chang teaches all of the limitations of claim 12 and also those limitations set forth in claims 14 and 15, but does not teach that the contact is formed under the dielectric layer as recited in claim 13. Rather, Ovshinsky teaches that metal contact 32 is formed in and over the dielectric pore and layer.

a. Holmberg et al. '705 is directed towards a programmable memory array having buried n+ wordline 56 formed on a p-type substrate 54 under n-type region 64 with a chalcogenide phase-change based memory structure formed thereover. The lower platinum silicide memory electrode 60 is formed under the insulation layer 66 and aligned with the

Art Unit: 2815

insulation pore. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed the electrode-under insulation structure as taught by Holmberg in the memory device of Ovshinsky at least for the purpose of not taking up addition space in the insulation pore, thereby enabling the pore to be formed of a smaller diameter and, in turn, enabling further miniaturization of the memory array.

b. Regarding claim 14, regardless of whether either of Ovshinsky or Holmberg expressly state that the function of the upper more lightly doped n-region is to reduce the reverse bias leakage of the n+ line, the underlying physics of carrier behavior in doped semiconductor junctions dictates that this function will necessarily result due to the presence of the lightly doped n-type layer.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 6/24/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Applicant argues that none of the references alone or in combination teach a buried line having a pair of more lightly doped regions around a more heavily doped region. The examiner agrees that none of the references *alone* teach every element of the claimed structure; if any reference had, a 102 anticipation rejection would have been issued. The examiner disagrees with the assertion that the references *in combination* do not teach every element. Rather, as was explained in the prior Office Action and restated hereinabove, Ovshinsky teaches a structure that

Art Unit: 2815

includes an n⁺ buried line 12 with a more lightly doped n region 14 above it, but does not anticipate at least the independent claims because it does not additionally teach a more lightly n-type layer below the n⁺ buried line 12. Chang does teach providing a more lightly doped region below a heavily doped n⁺ region of a pn diode. It is this feature, that when combined with Ovshinsky, renders the claims obvious.

b. Applicant further argues that “the examiner, in paragraph b, simply concludes, without any support whatsoever, that [combination of these references to produces this structure] would be obvious. Rather, there is absolutely no teaching in any of the references to do what is claimed.” The examiner disagrees, as was recited in the previous Office Action and restated hereinabove, “It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have further included additional, more lightly doped n-type regions between the n⁺ channel and p-substrate of the Ovshinsky memory device for the purpose of reducing current leakage as taught by Chang.” Restated, Chang both teaches the missing feature and provides motivation for why inclusion of this feature may be included in the Ovshinsky device. This motivation appears, for example, in col. 4, lines 10-30 of Chang, as was previously explained.

c. Applicant argues that there is no rationale to combine Chang, which relates to a diode, with Ovshinsky, which relates to a phase change material memory. The examiner disagrees. Both inventions relate to the same field of endeavor: memory diode structures wherein the n⁺ side of the diode is formed in a p-type substrate. Further, the motivation to combine was already explained above.

Art Unit: 2815

d. Applicant argues that there is no teaching of a buried line with a region of a second conductivity type opposite the first type over the line and under the phase change material memory. The examiner disagrees: as was explained, Ovshinsky teaches an n+ buried line 12 with a p+ region 24 formed between the buried line 12 and the chalcogenide memory material 36.

e. Accordingly, the claims remain rejected under the bases and for the reasons set forth in the previous Office Action.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2815


INFORMATION ON HOW TO CONTACT THE USPTO

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to the examiner, **B. William Baumeister**, at (703) 306-9165. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. If the Examiner is not available, the Examiner's supervisor, Mr. Eddie Lee, can be reached at (703) 308-1690. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

B. William Baumeister

Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2815

July 13, 2002



EDDIE LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800